Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-17 and 20-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-10, 12-16 and 20-26 are rejected. Claims 11 and 17 are objected to.

On page 2, the Official Action rejects claims 22, 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they are directed towards non-statutory subject matter. In order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has, therefore, cancelled claims 22, 23 and 25. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

On page 4, the Official Action rejects claims 1-10, 12-14, 20-22 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kikuchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,334). On page 7, the Official Action rejects claim 15 as being unpatentable over Kikuchi in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. On page 8, the Official Action rejects claims 16, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okita (JP 2001-169250) in view of Yogeshwar et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0096110). It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicant's invention, as recited in claim 1, includes a feature which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

> **... record management information that denotes a mutual association between said video signals that have the same contents but are compressed in a plurality of different bit rates, are recorded, respectively ...**

Claim 1 relates to a video signal that is compressed in a plurality of different bit rates (e.g. MPEG2 and MPEG4). A record management information is then recorded that shows a mutual association between the video signals that are compressed in the different bit rates (e.g. associates the MPEG2 and MPEG4 files with one another). This feature is found in the originally filed application on page 15, line 17 to page 16, line 13, page 18, line 22 to page 19, line 2 and Figs. 1 and 4C. No new matter has been added.

In col. 13, lines 10-15, Kikuchi suggests that compression can be done in either MPEG1 or MPEG2 formats ("*digital signal compressed at a variable bit rate on the basis of the MPEG2 or MPEG1 standard*"). An example of the encoder is shown in Kikuchi's Fig. 15 where V encoder 53 encodes the video signal in either MPEG1 or MPEG2 compression standards. Therefore, as a video signal comes into video encoder 53, it is encoded in a signal encoding technique (either MPEG 1 **or** MPEG 2).

In paragraphs 12 and 13, Yogeshwar suggests an IAF encoder that is able to encode video signals in various encoding standards. Specifically, an encoder control module is utilized to control the encoder to determine which of the plurality of encoding techniques will be utilized ("*an IAF encoder control module 540 determines, in conjunction with the AVARS control module 320 which encoding scheme will be used for a given set of input data*"). This is at least shown in Yogeshwar's Fig. 5 where IAF encoder 510 has encoders 1-N to select from. The IAF encoder module 540 selects which of the encoders (1-N) will be utilized to encode the signal input from the image processer 506. Thus, as a video signal is input to IAF encoder 510, it will go through one of the plurality of encoders based on the selection of the control module (the same signal does not get encoded in a plurality of techniques, it only gets encoded in a single technique).

Applicant's claim 1 is different than the art of record because of record management information that denotes a mutual association between a video signal having the same content compressed in different bit rates ("... *record management information that denotes a mutual association between said video signals that have the same contents but are compressed in a plurality of different bit rates, are recorded, respectively* ..."). This feature of Applicant's claim 1 is shown in at least Fig. 1. Specifically, video signal section 100 inputs the same video signal to both MPEG2 compression section 101 and MPEG 4 compression section 103. Thus, the same video signal (having the same contents) is compressed in two different bit rates (MPEG2 and MPEG4). This feature is at least supported in Applicant's specification on page 15, line 17 to page 16, line 13 ("*in Fig. 1, signals provided from an input section 100 ... are compressed by an MPEG 2 compression section 101, and a program stream including an MPEG 2 video stream is formed. In addition, the same signals are compressed by an MPEG 4 section 103, and an MPEG 4 stream including an MPEG 4 video stream is*

formed ... here, a bit rate of the program stream, which is provided by the MPEG 2 compression section 101, is approximately 9 mega bits per second, a bit rate of the MPEG 4 stream, which is provided by the MPEG 4 compression section 103, is approximately .5 mega bits per second"). Thus, in this example, the same video signal having the same contents is compressed in a bit rate of approximately 9 Mbps and also in a bit rate of approximately .5 Mbps (compressed in a plurality of different bit rates).

Furthermore, record management information is also recorded. Record management information denotes a mutual association between the signal that is compressed in the plurality of different bit rates. This feature is at least supported in Applicant's specification on page 18, line 22 to page 19, line 2 ("*the same video signal ... are recorded in different bit rates ... and co-record denoting information is stored as record management information including both file names and a record management file as shown in Fig. 4C*"). Thus, as shown in Fig. 4C, the MPEG2 compressed video and the MPEG4 compressed video have information such as their file names and an identifier stored as record management information. Record management information denotes a mutual association between the two files to identify that the differently compressed files have the same video contents.

Neither Kikuchi, Yogeshwar, Okita, AAPA nor their combination suggests the bolded feature from claim 1 above. Thus, the combination of these references is also deficient. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Claims 16, 20 and 26 have same similar features to claim 1. Thus, these claims are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

Dependent claims 2-15, 17 and 21 include all of the features of the claims from which they depend. Thus, these claims are also patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicant

RAE/fp

Dated: April 6, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

DMW/396327